

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

May 10, 2001

LB 305A, 305

that's all that we're appropriating for the purposes of LB 305, not the entire fund.

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So would you be willing to put "amount" instead of...

SENATOR RAIKES: I would be,...I...others may not, but I'll speak for myself. That makes more sense to me.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And I'm going to continue then and I'll at least do that. Members of the Legislature, as you read these bills you see things that other people may not see, may not notice, and these words may not seem to have any consequence. But I believe any time we are putting something into action which has the force of law, we should get in the practice of saying what we mean. And any of us, I especially, because I deal with words so often, may put a word in place which is not the word best suited to express the idea we have in mind. And I do not believe it is the intent to appropriate this fund. We're going to put an amount into that fund, and if we refer to that amount again we should say, which amount is hereby appropriated for this specific purpose. We're not going to take all of the money out of this fund. Here's what could happen, Senator Raikes, I'd like to ask you a question.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Raikes.

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, we could interpret the language as it exists now to mean that we are actually going to appropriate all of this money that's in that fund, if we choose to. We don't have to limit what is going to actually be spent to \$40 million; that's the additional amount we're putting into the fund. But if we're going to allow the appropriation of the entire fund then it could mean that this \$40 million, plus whatever else is necessary as expenditures, may be made. That could be...it could be construed that way, couldn't it? If not, what does that second fund, the fund with the small "f", what would it